## REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending in the application.

In the Office Action, independent claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boucher et al (EP 471,524).

The present invention is directed to a process to prepare a haze free base oil having a cloud point of below 0°C and a kinematic viscosity of 100°C of greater than 10 cSt from a Fischer Tropsch synthesis product. In the first step of the process, a Fischer Tropsch synthesis product is hydroisomerized. The effluent from this step is then subjected to distillation to obtain one or more fuel products and a distillation residue. The wax content of the distillation residue is then reduced by contacting it with a hydroisomerization catalyst. The effluent from this step is then subjected to solvent dewaxing to obtain the haze free base oil.

The Boucher et al reference is directed to a method of hydrotreating heavy isomerate fractionator bottoms to produce quality light oil upon subsequent re-fractionation. As illustrated in Fig. 1 of the reference and described on page 7, lines 1-20, a Fischer Tropsch synthesis product is hydrotreated (3) then hydroisomerized (4 & 5), then separated into a fuel fraction, a "heart cut" (9) and a heavy bottoms fraction (3). This residual fraction is sent to a severe hydrotreatment (14) and then recycled to the fractionator or hydroisomerization treatment. Only the heart cut is sent to the solvent dewaxing unit (10).

The process of Boucher et al is quite different from the present invention wherein the bottoms product from the fractionator is hydroisomerized and then solvent dewaxed to obtain the base oil. In Boucher, it is only the "heart cut" that is dewaxed to form the base oil.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by the Boucher et al reference nor would they have been obvious in view of this reference.

In the Office Action, claims 2-4, 9-10, 12, 14-16, 21-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boucher et al in view of Miller (US 6,699,385) and Sequeira. Claims 5-7, 11, 17-19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boucher et al in view of Hoek et al (WO 02/070628). Finally, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 as anticipated by or obvious over Boucher et al. Inasmuch as all of these claims are dependent either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 13,

Applicants submit that they are not anticipated nor would they have been obvious for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable action by the Examiner is requested. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of the claims that could be corrected by telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

NICHOLAS J. ADAMS and
GILBERT R. B. GERMAINE

By /Craig M. Lundell/
Their Attorney, Craig M. Lundell
Registration No. 30,284
(713) 241-2475

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463